

Remarks

The Office Action dated May 2, 2008 notes that Claims 4-5 and 7-8 are allowed and claims 12-13 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. The Office Action also maintains the rejection of claims 1-3 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Overtoom *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,218).

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-3 and 10-11 because the cited portions of the Overtoom reference are not arranged as required by the claimed invention. According to M.P.E.P. § 2131, the elements of a prior art reference must be arranged as required by a claim in order to anticipate the claim. In this instance the claimed invention requires that, during the second mode of operation, a further device station is coupled to a second communication port and a first device station is coupled to a first communication port. The Examiner asserts that A-port 202 and B-port 204 of Overtoom's hub 102 allegedly correspond to the first and second ports of the claimed bus station, respectively. The Examiner further identifies the situation when nothing is connected to B-port 204 as allegedly corresponding to the claimed second mode of operation. Thus, the cited portions of Overtoom teach that no device is coupled to B-port 204 during the Examiner's alleged second mode of operation, whereas the claimed invention requires that the further device station be coupled to the second port during the second mode. Moreover, the Examiner further asserts that Overtoom's alleged further device station is coupled to Overtoom's A-port 202 (*i.e.*, the Examiner's alleged first communication port), whereas the claimed invention requires that the further device station is coupled to the second port (alleged by the Examiner to be Overtoom's B-port 204). In view of the above, the cited portions of Overtoom are not arranged as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, the § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-3 and 10-11 is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant further traverses the § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-3 and 10-11 because the cited portions of the Overtoom reference do not correspond to the claimed invention which includes, for example, aspects directed to a bus station that is arranged to operate as an alternate host station in a second mode of operation. The Examiner's response does not address such distinctions and, rather, merely asserts that the Overtoom reference teaches use of the USB host controller 208 to communicate with two non-host devices

connected to port A per Figure 2, Col. 3:42-48. However, the cited portions of Overtoom do not teach that hub 102 operates as an alternate host during communications between two devices that are connected to A-ports 202. For example, the cited portions of Overtoom teach that B-port 204 is an override port to which hub 102 always defers control when a PC is connected thereto (*see, e.g.*, Figure 6, Col. 3:32-36, and Col. 5: 23-46). When the PC is not connected to B-port 204, hub 102 determines which of the devices connected to A-ports 202 are OTG devices (On-the-Go devices are dual-role devices that can act as a host) and then hub 102 waits for one of these devices to request host control of the USB bus (*see, e.g.*, Col. 3:59 to Col. 4:10). Thus, Overtoom's hub 102 simply enables the OTG devices connected to A-ports 202 to switch between which device acts as the host. Overtoom's hub 102 does not allow two non-host devices to communicate with each other because hub 102 merely transfers host control to a host device that is connected to one of A-ports 202. Therefore, Overtoom's hub 102 does not operate as an alternate host during communications between two devices that are connected to A-ports 202. Thus, the cited portions of the Overtoom reference do not correspond to the claimed invention. Accordingly, the § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-3 and 10-11 is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Aaron Waxler, of NXP Corporation at (347) 992-2889 (or the undersigned).

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
651-686-6633
(NXPS.407PA)